

**FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING
of the
Suffolk County Legislature**

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Finance & Financial Services Committee was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Auditorium, William Rogers Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on **June 20, 2001**, at 9:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Michael Caracciolo, Chairman
Legislator Maxine Postal, Vice Chair
Legislator Martin Haley
Legislator Cameron Alden
Legislator William Lindsay

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Paul Sabatino, Legislative Counsel
Richard Meyer, Department of Health Services
Phyllis Garbarino, AME
Nancy Manteiga, AME
Harry Greenberg, AME Counsel
George G. Krivosta, Crime Lab, ME, Health
Jim Calkins, Crime Lab, ME, Health
Todd Johnson, Intergovernmental Relations, County Executive's Office
Fred Pollert, Director, Budget Review Office
Jim Spero, Assistant Director, Budget Review Office
Terrance Pearsall, Legislator William Lindsay's Aide
Peter Quinn, Long Island Coalition for Democracy
Vincent Iaria, Probation Department
David Greene, Labor Relations
Ken Weiss, Budget Office, County Executive's Office
Clark Gavin, Presiding Officer Paul Tonna's Office
All Interested Parties

Minutes taken and transcribed by Irene Kulesa, Legislative Secretary

(The meeting came to order at 9:40 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

I call the Finance and Financial Services Committee Meeting to order. Would all please rise for a Pledge of Allegiance to be led by Legislator Lindsay.

SALUTATION

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Thank you. We have several speakers, Phyllis Garbarino, Richard Meyer and Peter Quinn. So if all three of you would please come up to the speakers' table and we'll start with Phyllis.

MS. GARBARINO:

Good morning. I would like to -- come with me, good morning Legislator Lindsay. I would like to have the -- since this is an issue on the Forensic Scientist in the Department of Health; Richard Meyers is here from the Health Department as you invited him to give their view on this. But we also have additional evidence, which if we could hand out to all of you to support our position of needing this resolution for the top step hiring. So with your permission, either we can hand out the information --

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Let's do that and then Mr. Meyer.

MS. GARBARINO:

This is Jim Calkins. He'll hand out the information to you and so this is really back again on the same issue. So if you want to hear the Health Department's issue and then you know, we could possibly refute that.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Well, as we indicated at the previous meeting, Dave Greene had suggested that we do so and we will avail ourselves today of doing that. And as you know, Phyllis, I have a resolution that I am considering.

MS. GARBARINO:

Yes, yes.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

And I have it right now with the Budget Review Office for financial impact.

MS. GARBARINO:

Okay. I think so, if you want to speak with Mr. Meyer?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Yes.

MS. GARBARINO:

And then we could discuss it.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Hi Richard.

MR. MEYER:

Good morning Legislator Caracciolo. Good morning Legislator Lindsay. Doctor Bradley received correspondence from your office; Legislator Caracciolo asking us to discuss Forensic Scientist salaries and we have had conversations with the Office of Labor Relations, Mr. Greene on the issue. So we have some familiarity with it, at this point in time.

In looking at the Forensic Scientist's salaries, I did a little bit of research on it and I'll give it to you, I think, over the next five minutes and then, I guess, we can go from there on the issue. We currently have no one in the Title of Forensic Scientist Trainee. That's a grade 17. Although, we will, probably within a week have someone in that Title. That appointment will be made effective next Monday. We currently have fifteen Forensic Scientist One's. We have eighteen Forensic Scientist Two's and we have seven Forensic Scientist Three's and these are all located in the Office of the Medical Examiners Crime Lab and the Toxicology Lab.

In addition to those Forensic Scientists, we have six additional Forensic Scientists Titles in the Office of the Public Health and Environmental Laboratory. Those break down as two Forensic Scientist One's, one Forensic Scientist Two and three Forensic Scientist Three's. There are currently three vacant FS2 positions, two of them are in our Serology Lab and one is in the Toxicology Lab and there is currently one vacant Forensic Scientist One position. The current salary range, Forensic Scientist One is a grade 19 and the salary range ranges from steps 8 to step 12, which is a range of forty six thousand, eight hundred and fifty dollars to fifty two thousand, nine hundred and thirty one dollars annually. The actual breakdown is four people are in step 8, two are in step 9, one is in step 10 and eight of those individuals are in top step, step 12. The mean salary for that group would be fifty thousand, four hundred and eighty one dollars annually.

Forensic Scientist Two is a grade 22 position. The current breakdown is the individuals are in steps 9 through 12. The salary range for those steps are fifty five thousand, one hundred and twenty three dollars to sixty thousand, three hundred and sixty nine dollars annually. That breaks down into a mean of fifty nine thousand, two hundred and eighty seven dollars

and the reason for that is that twelve of those individuals are in top steps, step 12, two in step 9, one is in step 10 and three are in step 11.

Finally in Forensic Scientist Three that's a grade 26. That has a range of steps 8 through 12 for the incumbents. The salary range there is sixty two thousand, nine hundred and fifty three dollars to seventy one thousand, one hundred and twenty three dollars and this breaks down to a mean salary of sixty nine thousand, three hundred and fifty nine dollars. Again, that's because the preponderance of individuals are in top step. That is five are in step 12. One is in step 8 and one is in step 10. In terms of turnover, which I think is one of the root of the issues. We haven't lost anyone this year, 2001. We did have a Forensic Scientist Two leave us in 2000. We had a Two leave us in 1999 and we lost four people in 1998. Two of them were in Forensic Scientist One Title, one was in a Forensic Scientist Two Title and one was in a Forensic Scientist Four Title. We currently don't have anyone in Forensic Scientist Four at this point in time.

The average length of service for Forensic Scientist One is approximately seven point three years. The average length of service, if you look at our incumbents today for Forensic Scientist Two is fourteen point five years and the average length of service for a Forensic Scientist Three is twenty three years. With respect to the six people we've lost since 1998, four have left to pursue alternate careers. Two have left, frankly, I couldn't find the research on it but it's certainly conceivable they left for higher salaries in their own profession in other jurisdictions. That gives you a rough breakdown of current salaries and our current turnover.

MS. GARBARINO:

With your permission if --

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Before you do that? Could you provide us with a copy of those statistics you just talked about?

MR. MEYER:

I'll give you all the demographics, absolutely.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Yes that would be helpful. Legislator Lindsay.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

More importantly than why people left; do you have a hard time hiring at the starting salary that we're offering?

MR. MEYER:

We haven't done a whole lot of hiring, frankly, in the Title in the past eighteen months.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

But you do have openings?

MR. MEYER:

We have -- right we have vacancies. They have not been released for us to begin the process of hiring. It's only fair and I don't wish to be disingenuous but if the Director of our Crime Lab indicates that he believes, he would have some trouble hiring. But again, the reality is we haven't been through the process lately. I can talk much easier about nurses, because we deal with that so much more often in so many other locations in the department. Forensic Scientists, we just haven't had enough openings in the last eighteen months where we pursued people.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

The four openings, does that cause a hardship on the department? The four vacancies?

MR. MEYER:

We run a vacancy rate of approximately 10 or 11 percent throughout the department and it's certainly budgeted for and certainly accounted for and divisions are expected to plan for. So it's in keeping with our percentage vacancies across the board but again, I think, if you had the directive of the Crime Lab or the directive of the Toxicology Lab here, they would tell you that they need every single body that they're budgeted for.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

Does this cause an overtime situation because of these vacancies?

MR. MEYER:

We certainly do have overtime at the Medical Examiner's Office. It's one of our more predominant divisions, if you will.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Thank you Legislator Lindsay. To follow-up on the last question, in terms, of overtime compensation? What is the department's budget for Forensic Scientists on an annual basis and what is it presently year to date?

MR. MEYER:

In terms of overtime? I would have to get you those hard numbers. I don't have them in front of me now but I will certainly provide as part of any packet of information to the committee.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Okay and let's also go back three years or four years to do some comparisons?

MR. MEYER:

Oh, absolutely. I can do that, sure.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Okay. Phyllis, I know you wanted to raise an issue? So please feel free to do so.

MS. GARBARINO:

Well, Mr. Calkins is here from the Medical Examiner's Office. He brought the information that he handed out to you and perhaps he could explain some of that. And just as you said, where you're asking for more information, I would also look for an expeditious movement on this now. I realize you need all the information. But to put this package together as quickly as possible, if we can move forward on it, rather than delay it several months more?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Well, there's no intentional delay here. Fred, in terms of the requests? I had submitted to your office a draft resolution for the issue -- to address the issue that we've been speaking of about redressing Forensic Scientists salaries. And I've asked you to do a financial impact statement.

MR. POLLERT:

Yes, we're in the process of doing a fiscal impact statement. It's just about completed. The problem that we ran into was we have equivalent to Labor Relations, with respects to the individuals that were previously hired that are not at top step. Whether or not they would be moved to top step. If you start to hire at top step and whether or not retroactive pay would be required for those individuals. So I believe that we're waiting for a return phone call with respect to that issue.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Okay. We will try to get those individuals responsible for this information to respond as soon

as possible.

MS. GARBARINO:

Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Okay.

MS. GARBARINO:

But if Mr. Calkins could explain some of what he handed out to you, perhaps? So you would -
- because just a naked eye view of it you might not realize --

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

I don't have a problem with that. The only problem I do have is when we only deal with selective information. I have a big problem with that. So as long as your presentation isn't being selective, I don't have a problem with that.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

Mr. Chairman, before -- could I just ask Phyllis something that Fred brought up?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Sure.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

Are we -- Phyllis, are we looking to hire people at the very top step and how many people do we have that is working at less than the top step, in that --

MS. GARBARINO:

I believe those statistics are in the package. Jim, could you say that how many are working right now?

MR. CALKINS:

It's not a complete. I got as many -- what you have before you is a summary of qualifications for numerous people working in the Crime Lab at the present time at the Forensic Scientist grade. I wasn't able to get everybody in the Laboratory and I don't have a hard number for you. But as you go through, you can see there's hired at top step, hired top step, promoted to top step. What has happened is that prior to 1998, prior to 1998, between 1983 and 1998, everybody was hired and promoted to top step. In 1998, there seems to be a decision not to do this any longer and what we were asking for is to go back to the spirit of the legislation rather than just the --

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

Well, we're talking top step in grade, right?

MS. GARBARINO:

Right.

MR. CALKINS:

Yes.

MS. GARBARINO:

I believe -- maybe Mr. Meyer might have that in the documentation he has with him to answer your question, Legislator Lindsay.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

I just wanted to know how many people we're talking about between '98 and now that you know, we would be faced with? I mean, are we looking at a retroactive situation? Or are we just looking for promotions?

MS. GARBARINO:

To place everybody where they are, I don't believe it's many people and maybe --

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

Okay but Phyllis you're looking for retroactive pay?

MS. GARBARINO:

Yes. Well, because it would be the people that are there several years would be lower than somebody just coming on board. So there would have to be an equality issue there. We're talking about maybe a few people. It's not like a department of fifty or a hundred people.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

What is the --

MS. GARBARINO:

Not retroactive, I'm sorry. It's not retroactive. It's just to put them at top step at that time, not retroactivity. I'm sorry, I was misinterpreting that. But that would be just to put them at top step at that time, if this resolution is passed.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

But at this time?

MS. GARBARINO:

At this time, yes.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

This time. That was Legislator Lindsay's question.

MS. GARBARINO:

Yes, I'm sorry. At this time, not retroactive from the time they were hired, just at this time.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Very good.

MR. CALKINS:

That would be a burden on the County with the fiscal condition.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay. Which raises an interesting question. The Union and the County just negotiated a new labor contract?

MS. GARBARINO:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

A tentative agreement. Was this issue a subject of those negotiations?

MS. GARBARINO:

It's been a side issue. Because this has been on the table for a while, as far as working with the County to try to get this done. So it's not part -- it would not be part of the contract. Because it addresses an Individual Title.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Was there a reluctance on the part of the County's labor negotiated to consider this issue as part of an overall settlement?

MS. GARBARINO:

I really didn't get that feeling.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Okay, all right. That's important for the record.

MS. GARBARINO:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Okay. Yes, Mr. Meyer?

MR. MEYER:

In terms of the actual numbers, currently in Forensic Scientist One, there are seven people who are not in top step, step 12. Four of those are in step 8, two are in step 9, 1 in step 10 and I don't think I have to point this out but I will. Obviously, the timeframe would have some significance here, in that each one of these individuals are going to move up a step in about eleven days.

MS. GARBARINO:

Right.

MR. MEYER:

Pursuant to the current bargaining agreement. Forensic Scientist Two, if you're talking about moving -- and I apologize, I haven't seen the proposed legislation. But if you're talking about each of the categories, in Forensic Scientist Two, you'd be moving a total of six people, two are in step 9, one is in step 10 and three are in step 11. And again, if you're talking about a timeframe, three of those people would be at top step.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Richard, what I'd like you to do is provide me with a copy of that information, so Budget Review will have the most current information to make in the cost comparisons and financial impacts, so we know exactly what the differential would be. Legislative Counsel?

MR. SABATINO:

Just to remind the committee of the point that I made a couple of meetings ago. Since 1982, the Legislature has not been able to do unilateral {up-steppings} or {up-gradings} for people covered under Collective Bargaining because of a PERB ruling for 1982. AME continues to raise that legal argument in proceedings that are currently pending. I have no problem with the reassertion of legislative power. I think it's a good thing for the Legislature. But you might just want to get two things. One is make sure that Labor Relations and the Executive are going to adhere to the resolution, even though we're doing something that's been ruled improper since 1982. And secondly, I think you need to get AME on the record to say that they now -- they no longer object to unilateral legislative adjustments for steps or grades. Because it's a complete reversal of nineteen years of PERB ruling so --

MS. GARBARINO:

This is AME Counsel, Harry Greenberg. Maybe he could respond to Mr. Sabatino.

MR. GREENBERG:

Good morning.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Good morning.

MR. GREENBERG:

This is a very unique situation. We're not asking for reversal of the PERB ruling. The {up-steppings} have not been a problem, as I understand it, from the County Executive's position. And we're asking just to address the Forensic Scientist situation and not reverse anything that's in place right now.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Will this become a precedent that the Union will point to, if the Legislature is so inclined to approve it? To come back to the Legislature or the County in the future and make adjustments in other job titles and salary grades?

MR. GREENBERG:

I'm not sure about your question. Could you be more specific?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Well, it's a very simple question.

MR. GREENBERG:

Well, I apologize if I'm not --

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

As a learned Counsel, I'm sure you do understand the question. Maybe Phyllis would like to answer the question as the chief representative for AME.

MR. GREENBERG:

I can say this. That we're not looking to make this situation presidential in any manner.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Okay, I'd like Phyllis to respond to the same question.

MS. GARBARINO:

What the intent of this is to really return, even though there was a PERB ruling in 1982. To return to the spirit, because this is so long standing, this issue that the problem existed over twenty years ago. That's why legislation was passed for specifically, the Forensic Scientist. To say that the Union will want to come there for every single title --

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

That's my understanding in conversations with you.

MS. GARBARINO:

Right but we do have -- because we do have several -- it's only when it's a very special need. We have in place right now that nurses come in at higher than the entry level, because of the difficulty in hiring. It's done on a very isolated basis. And since AME represents fifteen hundred titles, there would be no intent of the Union to come to you with all of these titles. We're very conservative when it comes to addressing issues such as this. And the only reason we're here with this Forensic Scientist issue is because it was a twenty-year past practice because they proved the need at that time and then the hiring went on even though the language apparently, according to an arbitrator, was not the intent. So we want to correct that. That the intent of twenty years of need and you've received a preponderance of evidence showing you the need for this particular title, to continue to be hired at the top of the step system regardless of what the number of that step is. Because you all are familiar that that contractually changes regularly.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Are there other inequities, in terms, of this past practice within your organization with individuals you represent? That at a later date, you will come to the Legislature and request adjustment?

MS. GARBARINO:

This is the only one that has come to me at this point. I do not --

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

I understand that.

MS. GARBARINO:

Right.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

I understand that. I think what I'm looking for is some assurance that this doesn't open the floodgates and six months from now, a year from now and on an ongoing basis, the Union comes back outside of the recent labor negotiated settlement and attempt to make other adjustments to other job titles and salary grades.

MS. GARBARINO:

That is not the intent for the Union to come forward with that.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Okay. That's very important, thank you. Okay, anyone else like to make a comment? Yes, Richard.

MR. MEYER:

Thank you Legislator Caracciolo. I just need to say one other thing that has come up, at least, in discussions in the department's administration and I feel necessary to put on the record. There is probably little disagreement or opposition to hiring Forensic Scientist One at top step. That has been an issue that's gone back and forth and we could understand that if we had a Forensic Scientist Trainee and they were promoted and we were hiring Forensic Scientist One's in top step that might be an issue, whereby top step would be justified. But on the same manner, there is a philosophical opposition in the department to going further, from taking the Forensic Scientist Two and Three positions and moving them to top step. And the philosophy lies upon the fact that we have a department of sixteen hundred members in which they all have to live with the rules of the game, if you will, whereby if you get a promotion, you get a 3 percent raise or thereabouts and then you move back up your step system. We hire public health nurses and registered nurses in-step but when they get a promotion they don't go to the next level to top step, they go up according to the ladder. And I don't know if that's part of the resolution or not but it has come up in discussion and for the record, I needed to get that out there from the department.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

We will be happy to provide the department with a copy of the resolution.

MR. MEYER:

Thank you.

MS. GARBARINO:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Okay. Thank you all. Okay is there any -- Peter Quinn? Is there anyone who has arrived that would like to address the committee after Mr. Quinn?

MR. QUINN:

Good morning Mr. Chairman, members of the committee. I'm here to speak on two issues. One of which is energy and the other, which is Suffolk County Industrial Development Agency perks. And although, I recognize that the Economic Development and Energy Committee meets tomorrow and it probably would be preferable that I appear at that meeting. I have a conflict and since this deals with finances, I thought it would be more appropriate to come before this committee.

The issue on energy concerns me, since last week, I received from Budget Review and Fred Pollert a three-page document dealing with energy expenditures by the County and I meant to bring it today and left it home on the table. At any rate, one of the glaring things that appeared on a list of expenditures by the County on energy is the Southwest Sewer District, it had suggested that the amount of money this year for the Southwest Sewer District, the

cost is over three million dollars. Since the County is laying out over fifteen million dollars, this accounts for 20 percent of Suffolk County's energy bill. A sizable amount. Now, as you know, Mr. Chairman, I've been involved with the energy issue for a number of years and I have attempted to get the County to embark on an Energy Efficiency Program.

A year and a half ago, Gordian Raacke from the Citizens Advisory Panel and Ben Wright from Public Works joined me in going to Yonkers to see the fuel cell, which is about the size of a tractor trailer located there. And Ben Wright wrote a report for the Suffolk County Electrical Agency of which I am an appointed member by this Legislature and he pointed out something about anaerobic digesters and thought that that might be a problem for the Southwest Sewer District. But the fact is; there are a hundred and one large fuel cells being used across the country, yet we have none on Long Island, the large type. And the smaller type fuel cells have run into all kinds of technical problems, so -- but that isn't the point I'm making. The point I'm making is that if at the Southwest Sewer District, if they were to be installed two fuel cells, I believe that you could substantially reduce the energy cost, not only in the Southwest Sewer District but in turn the County as well.

Now the cost, while it may appear prohibitive is a good investment. The fact is the cost is eight hundred thousand dollars for a fuel cell but there's a two hundred thousand-dollar rebate by the Federal Government. So it will cost six hundred thousand dollars and I believe that that money could be recouped in a matter of a year or two, if this fuel cell type product could be installed. So I am urging that this committee and the County Legislature invite someone from the Department of Energy, maybe a regional representative of the Department of Energy who is familiar with the fuel cell at Yonkers, to come and make a presentation and give you the cost factors and why it will work or won't work at the Southwest Sewer District. It seems to me there's been an inordinate delay and while we're talking about an energy crisis, it's most appropriate that we consider this as an option. That's one point.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Legislator Postal has a question, then before we conclude; I'd like to just brainstorm with you a little bit about your alternative energy proposals to deal with the limited amount of electrical generation available to Nassau and Suffolk County.

LEGISLATOR POSTAL:

It's not really a question. It's kind of a response, Pete. It's funny that you should mention that because just very recently, within the past few weeks, a number of us, number one, decided that we would, as policy, adopt resolutions that would have the County taking advantage of NYPA's energy conservation procedures, both in the County facilities as a whole and specifically for the community college. But also with regard to fuel cells, a few years back, maybe three years ago, a resolution was passed in this Legislature sponsored by George Guldi, which I think I co-sponsored that said the County would do a Pilot Program with fuel cells and I don't remember whether specific, in the wording, of the resolution was mentioned at Bergen Point as the largest facility, energy consuming facility in the County. So while I don't remember if Bergen Point was mentioned specifically, it was definitely mentioned in the discussion. That would be a really good place to pilot these fuel cells to see if this was an efficient and effective form of energy production for us and I hadn't heard anything. So I guess about three weeks ago, I sent a letter to the Department of Public Works asking them whatever happened with that Pilot Program. I haven't had an answer yet but I -- you know it's interesting that you bring this up because obviously, the Legislature agreed with you that we should, at least, be piloting the use of fuel cells as an alternative energy source. And we voted by majority to do that and I don't think anything has happened. But I'm still awaiting my answer from DPW.

MR. QUINN:

I recall George Guldi's legislation, resolution. I think it simply died. I don't know that --

LEGISLATOR POSTAL:

We passed it.

MR. QUINN:

You passed the resolution but I think Public Works didn't enact any effort.

LEGISLATOR POSTAL:

It even provided the money to do it. It was not just a, you know a statement of policy. We appropriated the money to allow DPW to go forward and you know apparently, I'm assuming, because I haven't had an answer. Nothing has happened. I think it would be interesting to find out what our options are, as a Legislature, when a County Department doesn't follow through with policy we've established.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Counsel?

MR. SABATINO:

I think the first thing -- I do recall the resolution. I pulled it up a couple of weeks ago because the issue had come up and I think we appropriated four hundred thousand or six hundred thousand. So the first thing is to find out what happened to the money. Then the second thing would be to bring them before the pertinent committee and track it down. I think there was an eighteen-month deadline or period of time that was allowed for the program to get underway and I don't know if the eighteen months has run out. So those are factual questions. But those are the initial things that you have to look at.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Counsel, which committee should make that request?

MR. SABATINO:

That really should be the -- that was an energy initiative. It should be the Energy Committee.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Would you convey that to the Chairman of that Committee?

MR. SABATINO:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Thank you. Peter, let me just add to what Legislator Postal has mentioned, regarding recent resolution introductions, one of which I sponsored was laid on the table at the last legislative meeting. It requires the Community College in particular, as well as a separate resolution that requires the Department of Public Works in particular, to request but actually conduct energy audits under the NYPA Program and then seek reimbursements through NYPA or energy credits from the State to implement those programs.

MR. QUINN:

Great minds think alike. The Suffolk County Electrical Agency has been discussing this for the last two months. There was an energy audit back in 1988, by Public Works, of all of its facilities and we thought that it wasn't implemented primarily, because we went into a recession right after that. But there have been some energy renovations that have occurred to various buildings, including this building. And we've asked Michael Monaghan, who is a Senior Engineer from Public Works, who came to our meeting to prepare a list, I believe, that was turned over to Tom LaGuardia, is it? And he indicated he would complete that list of buildings, which need energy efficiency renovations within six weeks. That was about a week ago, he called me. So we should have some kind of energy audit update information and -- so that will enable the Legislature to determine how to proceed at a later time. But in response to your earlier question --

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Supply and demand.

MR. QUINN:

You know that I have long been an advocate of energy efficiency and conservation and therefore, opposed endless building of power plants based upon the manipulation of an energy crisis. I don't see that. Here LIPA has fifty three hundred nine megawatts of capacity. If you saw Newsday's report that LIPA provided on the number of times that LIPA and previously LILCO had exceeded four thousand megawatts, it turns out it was sixteen times over a ten year period. That means a little more than once a year, primarily on a hot humid day of summer that you would exceed four thousand megawatts and most of the time, it was around forty two hundred megawatts. That tells me that there is a substantial cushion and besides which when LIPA agrees with businesses to call them and let them know on a hot humid day that they can -- they are being asked to voluntarily reduce power. It tells me that there is very little likelihood that we're going to see that one day that we saw in, I think, it was July of '99, July 6th, of '99 when the peak load reached forty five hundred thirty megawatts, somewhere in that vicinity.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

So you disagree with LIPA with respect to their concern that there could be brownouts and/or blackouts here as the residents of California are now experiencing on almost a daily basis?

MR. QUINN:

I don't see the comparison at all, as Kessel talked about and my commenting about the amount of fossil fuels that LIPA is expending. At the Summit Meeting the other day when Legislator Dave Bishop asked -- here LIPA is spending one point one billion dollars for fossil fuels and only spending thirty seven million dollars this year on energy efficiency and conservation. I think there's an extraordinary imbalance and that there must be a greater expenditure of money on energy efficiency and conservation. But how do you do that? You'll never do it as long as you continue to build power plants, buy more fossil fuel and have to pay off the bonds plus interest. So Wall Street finds -- to finance the building of power plants very appealing. But very few, including government, wants to do enough of energy efficiency -- become it and make it an every day kind of belief and concern for our environment.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

I don't want to belabor this point because it's really not the purview of this committee but just one more question in this context. As we sit here today, what is LIPA's reserve capacity, should a power plant go down and that's part of the problem in California, in terms of, you know trying to meet their daily requirements. They've had plants down for maintenance. They've had plants down for emergency repairs. What do we have locally? In the By-County region to deal with that contingency?

MR. QUINN:

Well, as I said, there are fifty three hundred and nine megawatts. So that's thirteen hundred megawatts more than a typical summer day. By the way, what we're doing is allowing the utility to budget for or express its concerns over one day for two hours. What is going on the other three hundred and sixty four days and twenty-two hours in the course of the year? The utility is using most frequently and by the way, in that graft that was shown in Newsday, there were some years where they didn't even reach four thousand megawatts. So there was a considerable gap between what capacity they had and what peak load actually is -- actually could be during some hot summer day.

You talk about some -- the possibility of downtime? Those peak load plants are used almost never. They use base load and intermediate plants for most of the year and they only turn on the peak load plants, because they're the dirtiest and most polluting, on a limited basis. When you get over thirty eight hundred megawatts then you've got to start using some of

the peak load plants. So I would argue that before and I would even argue that while Kessel proposed to this Legislature at the Summit that you write a letter to Connecticut to get them to back off their protection of oyster beds, I said come on, why should you be a party to assisting LIPA after the damage that LIPA has done to Suffolk County. But I would certainly argue against the three hundred and thirty megawatt for one cable and the second one for three hundred and thirty -- six hundred we would have. If we built all of those power plants and cables that are being proposed, we would double the island's capacity. That's throwing money away and that's a very wasteful energy policy.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Does that policy predicate on the plants that are in existence being available indefinitely? Or is there a cost efficiency with new power plant and the power supply?

MR. QUINN:

Well, before I even answer that question, I would say, there are ways in which government can involve itself in reducing megawatt usage. You know, in January, LIPA contended that there was a two point seven percent increase in usage and before we've gone five months, they now said it's three point seven, three point five percent increase. And I could recall back in the days when LILCO was saying the same thing, 4 percent increase annually in the '80's.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Peter, it's always a pleasure. We have to get to an agenda.

MR. QUINN:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. QUINN:

I just wanted to suggest one point though. If we had the State or the Federal Government or even the County Government involve itself in rebates, the refrigerator rebate would be the classic way to go. It's used twenty-four hours a day in residential homeowners' houses. It accounts for forty percent of a homeowner's electric use. Give a four hundred dollar rebate to customers to go out and buy the most efficient refrigerator, one that uses less than five hundred kilowatt hours on an annual basis, compared to the ones they are now using that are a thousand or more in many households, depending on how old it is and you would see a substantial reduction. Three to five hundred megawatts reduction within five years.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Thank you. Legislator Haley.

LEGISLATOR HALEY:

I actually need a whole new kitchen. So we can work on the stove and the --

MR. QUINN:

Go to Sears, they'll show you --

LEGISLATOR HALEY:

Are you coming to the meeting tomorrow for Energy and Environment?

MR. QUINN:

I just explained earlier, I don't know if you were here, I have a conflict. So I don't think I will be. But that's the reason I came here today.

LEGISLATOR HALEY:

All right. Just quickly, I understand that -- and that's what I got out of that presentation by Mr. Kessel, is there's an awful lot of things in the hopper that are going to far exceed what

they've projected their needs are. And I think that might have to do with the fact that they're probably estimated a success rate. Not everything that's proposed is going to come on line. Not every cable is necessarily going to be approved. That's just a comment. If they mitigate the oyster bed problem, which seems to be Connecticut's primary opposition to the cable. If they mitigate that problem, would you rather see a cable, as opposed to new plants?

MR. QUINN:

Both cost a substantial amount of money. When you devote money to supply side energy efforts, then you minimize demand side monies. You only have a pool of money to spend and if you spend it all on building power plants and cable, then you don't spend any money -- we already see that and what LIPA is spending.

LEGISLATOR HALEY:

All right. Let me rephrase that?

MR. QUINN:

Okay.

LEGISLATOR HALEY:

You have no other choice. Cable or power plant? Which one do you want?

MR. QUINN:

One power plant at a time. Because you're buying --

LEGISLATOR HALEY:

I'll ask you again, Peter, cable or power plant?

MR. QUINN:

What you're doing with the cable --

LEGISLATOR HALEY:

I'm finished. Thank you Mr. Quinn.

MR. QUINN:

Okay. You're buying power from off Long Island and I don't think that that's the most desirable way to go.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Peter, does the Suffolk County Electrical Agency at any time make a presentation to the Legislature's Energy and Environment Committee? Energy Committee, Education is it? Is it Energy and Education now, Paul? What is it?

MR. SABATINO:

It's Energy and Economic Development now.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Energy and Economic Development.

MR. QUINN:

Yes, I have addressed my concerns to Jonathon Cooper and I --

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Well, I mean, do you prepare a report on an annual basis? I mean, we appointed you and Jack Kulka and other people and we want you to be proactive and involved but we also want you to report back to us and let us know your thoughts.

MR. QUINN:

Okay. Well, that's essentially why I'm here.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

But this is not the committee that you should be appearing before.

MR. QUINN:

Oh, you're right. We should appear before them on a regular basis. At least annually.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

In twenty-five words or less, can you just give me a summary of where the Electrical Agency is, in terms, of using its allocation for Suffolk County?

MR. QUINN:

We currently have, by statute, four companies that use over four hundred-kilowatt hours on an annual basis, receiving a total of five megawatts.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

How many companies are involved in that?

MR. QUINN:

Four.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Four and what companies -- what institutions are they?

MR. QUINN:

Newsday, Sage, L&F, the other one escapes me for the moment. Four companies. Because we've tried to get from LIPA a list of those companies that use two hundred kilowatt hours on an annual basis. Because then that would expand the pool and we've been trying to get that information. They refuse to supply it and tell us that that is a confidential and you know information. So they're not disclosing it to us. But if we had the larger pool to work with, we could supply -- it would be a discounted rate to a larger number of companies.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Have you attempted to work through the large business associations, to see which of their members may be candidates for this type of relief?

MR. QUINN:

Well, sure, Jack Kulka has --

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

HIA?

MR. QUINN:

HIA attempted to do that. But we haven't been able to resolve it. But we also discovered that Legislator Fisher created an Energy Advisory Committee. We invited her to our last meeting with their Chair, Alice Amhrein in an attempt to find out what they were doing and I got assigned as the Liaison to that Committee. So whatever steps we take should be done jointly together and we'd like to work with the Legislature to push energy efficiency in the County.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Does that Advisory Committee have any mandate?

MR. QUINN:

No, not that I know of. Although I haven't been to a --

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

So it's just a bunch of people get together and --

MR. QUINN:

And talk.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Talk.

MR. QUINN:

It's Advisory. The other point quickly that I wanted to bring up was the Industrial Development Agency and Legislator Postal will certainly know.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Yes. Before you go on --

LEGISLATOR POSTAL:

On the Bergen Point issue. We very recently got a voluminous report from a Consultant Bartilucci, on alternative methods of sludge disposals, my favorite topic. And in reading it, there are a number of different alternatives that are studied and discussed and obviously, they all have pros and cons. We, in the Legislature, are having another consultant do a report on the same issue. And I suspected that at the time that someplace down the road, there's going to be some legislation based on one of these reports or both of these reports to either upgrade or replace or install a new sludge disposal system. And I think that just, in terms, of our Budget Review Office, one of the considerations that is discussed in the Bartilucci report is the energy consumption required for each of the different methods. And I think that it's going to be very important down the line when we consider whatever is proposed, as a replacement alternative, whatever. That we weigh the cost of energy as well as the cost of construction of -- and whatever other costs there are in whatever method of sludge disposal we're going to use. So I just make that request to the Budget Office kind of way in advance of any legislation that may come down.

MR. QUINN:

While they're discussing something -- who provides us with the water? Suffolk County Water Authority, I went blank there for a moment. Suffolk County Water Authority also consumed a great deal of energy from its pumps to pump water, the electricity involved and so on. We don't have a specific report on what energy they are using. But I think it would be useful to have that information as well. On the --

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Peter, we have to stop there.

MR. QUINN:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

We have to get to an agenda.

MR. QUINN:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

I appreciate you coming by.

MR. QUINN:

Thank you. Can I just leave a letter that I provided to Jonathon Cooper about the IDA?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Sure, if you would leave that with the Clerk, we'll make copies and distribute it.

MR. QUINN:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Legislative Counsel?

MR. SABATINO:

I just had doubled checked the record. That appropriation, Legislator Postal is two hundred thousand dollars and it was 1998 and the deadline was July 31st, of '99. So I'll forward this to the Chairman of that Committee then.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Okay. Is there anyone else who would like to address this committee? We will go to today's agenda. Please turn to page one. Tabled resolution 1261 before us. Mr. Weiss, would you like to join us in case we have any questions?

LEGISLATOR POSTAL:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Motion to table by Legislator Postal, second by Legislator Lindsay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Unanimously tabled.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS - PRIME:

I.R. NO. 1261 Adopting Local Law No. -2001, A Charter Law to stabilize real property taxes by optimizing use of the tax stabilization reserve fund. ASSIGNED TO FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 TABLED

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

1262 same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Same vote.

I.R. NO. 1262 Adopting Local Law No. -2001, A Charter Law to streamline Suffolk County 5-25-5 debt policy. ASSIGNED TO FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 TABLED

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

1264, explanation, Counsel?

MR. SABATINO:

Well, I think, this kind of hinges on what happens with 1261. So this should really be treated in tandem.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Yes. Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Same vote.

I.R. NO. 1264 Amending Section 719-6 of the Suffolk County Code. ASSIGNED TO FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 TABLED

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

1487, explanation?

MR. SABATINO:

This was Legislator Crecca's bill to strike the appropriations in equipment supplies and special services at three point four million dollars. This was to strike the appropriation, as opposed to what the Executive had already done, has already done, I should say, which is to just basically embargo the funds. The difference is that if you strike the funds, the appropriations are no longer available at the end of the year as potential offset for some other action. What the Executive done is he's already frozen the allocation of those funds but at least the

appropriation is available if you need for an offset. If this is adopted, then the appropriation is totally stricken and it's never available again. So it's a policy choice.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

You're talking about 1487?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

Isn't that the County Executive's bill?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

No, it's a Crecca bill. That's a typo. That's a typo.

LEGISLATOR POSTAL:

I make a motion to table.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Motion to table by Legislator Postal. Is there a second?

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Second by Legislator Lindsay. All in favor? Opposed? I'm opposed. The tabling motion fails. Two in favor, three opposed. I'm going to make a motion to approve. Is there a second? Legislator Haley, okay. All in favor? Opposed?

LEGISLATOR POSTAL:

I'm opposed.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

I'm opposed.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Two opposed. The resolution is approved.

I.R. NO. 1487 Implementing budget cuts for equipment, supplies, travel, special services and fees for services to partially offset sales and compensating use tax increase without property tax increase. ASSIGNED TO FINANCE FINANCIAL SERVICES (Legislator Crecca)

VOTE: 3-2-0-0 APPROVED

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Sense 15-2001 memorializing resolution requesting U.S. Congress to enact Bush Tax Cut Plan. This has substantially been approved by the Congress with some modifications. Is that not correct, Counsel?

MR. SABATINO:

Well, yes. What was adopted is significantly different from Sense 15.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

Okay, was Sense 16 the four one point six billion dollar Bush Tax Cut Proposal?

MR. SABATINO:

Sense 15 said as proposed. There were no changes and no modification.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILOLO:

All right, so at this point that it would be fair to say that this resolution is academic?

MR. SABATINO:

The wording would have to be changed to conform to reality.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Motion to table subject to call.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Motion by Legislator Alden to table subject to call. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
Tabled subject to call.

TABLED - SENSE - PRIME

Sense 15-2001 Memorializing resolution requesting United States Congress to enact Bush Tax Cut Plan. ASSIGNED TO FINANCIAL & FINANCIAL SERVICES (Legislator Allan Binder)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 TABLED SUBJECT TO CALL

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

I.R. 1533. Is there a motion? On the resolution?

LEGISLATOR POSTAL:

I want to modify the motion.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Counsel can we put these on the consent calendar?

MR. SABATINO:

Yes, these are eligible.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Okay. The next four resolutions are eligible for consent calendar. I'm sorry the next three resolutions. Motion by Legislator Alden to place on the consent -- to approve and place on the consent calendar I.R. 1533, 34, 35. Seconded by Legislator Lindsay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Unanimous.

INTRODUCTORY - PRIME

I.R. NO. 1533 To readjust, compromise and grant refunds and charge-backs on correction of errors by: County Legislature. ASSIGNED TO FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED PLACE ON CONSENT CALENDAR

I.R. NO. 1534 To readjust, compromise and grant refunds and charge-backs on correction of errors/County Treasurer By: County Legislature #132 ASSIGNED TO FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED PLACE ON CONSENT CALENDAR

I.R. NO. 1535 To readjust, compromise and rant refunds and charge-backs on correction of errors/County Treasurer By: County Legislature #131 ASSIGNED TO FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED PLACE ON CONSENT CALENDAR

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

1586 is before us. Counsel?

LEGISLATOR POSTAL:

I'd like to hear an explanation before we make any motion?

MR. SABATINO:

Okay, 1586 is the legislation which arose out of the Budget Review Report, pages 33 and 34 that was issued on May 18th, with regard to the Capital Budget. This is the portion of the report that raised concerns about past management borrowing procedures. Essentially what this resolution would do is it would create a nine-member committee that would be obligated to meet on the last Friday of each and every month. Subsequent to its effective date, all the way through December 31st, 2002, to meet on a coordinated basis to try to deal with all of the issues that were raised in that report, which were basically attracting and coordinating the Capital Projects. The issue of State and Federal reimbursement on Capital Projects and the past borrowing practices.

LEGISLATOR HALEY:

Counsel, is this in perpetuity?

MR. SABATINO:

No, December 31st, of 2002.

LEGISLATOR HALEY:

So it ends 2002.

MR. SABATINO:

Unless it's extended by a subsequent resolution.

LEGISLATOR HALEY:

Why does it have to be Fridays? You can't get anything done in the County on Mondays or Fridays.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Motion to approve by --

MR. SABATINO:

There were a lot of things that went wrong earlier in the week.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Yes, I made the motion, seconded by Legislator Postal. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Add me as co-sponsor.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Add Legislator Alden as co-sponsor.

LEGISLATOR HALEY:

Can we modify and put Brian Foley on this committee?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

It's approved 1586.

I.R. NO 1586 To establish unified cash management and borrowing procedure committee. ASSIGNED TO FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (Presiding Officer Paul Tonna) Co-sponsor Legislator Cameron Alden

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 APPROVED

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

We now have before us I.R. Non-Prime 1551, 52, 56, 57, 59, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 73, 1577, 1587, 1588, 1589, 1591. A motion by the Chair to approve and defer to prime committee, second by Legislator Alden. Defer to Prime. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved.

INTRODUCTORY - NON PRIME

I.R. NO. 1551 Accepting and appropriating 100% grant funds from the New York State Department of Labor and the Department of Temporary and Disability Assistance to Suffolk County Department of Social Services for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) ASSIGNED TO SOCIAL SERVICES AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 DEFER TO PRIME

I.R. NO. 1552 Accepting and appropriating 100% grant funds from the NYS Office of Emergency Management for hurricane & coastal storm initiatives. ASSIGNED TO PUBLIC SAFETY & PUBLIC INFORMATION AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 DEFER TO PRIME

I.R. NO. 1556 Accepting and appropriating a grant in the amount of \$186,000 from the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services for the Suffolk County Police Department to continue the Bellport Targeted Enforcement Program, with 75% support. ASSIGNED TO PUBLIC SAFETY & PUBLIC INFORMATION AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 DEFER TO PRIME

I.R. NO. 1557 Accepting and appropriating 53.4% Federal grant funds from the United Way of Long Island to the Department of Health Services, Division of Patient Care Services for the Ryan White Title I, HIV Dental Clinics Program and creating a 60% Dental Director - Health Services. ASSIGNED TO HEALTH AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 DEFER TO PRIME

I.R. NO. 1559 Re-accepting and re-appropriating 73.4% Federal Grant funds from the New York State Division of Criminal Justice to the Department of health Services, Division of Forensic Sciences for a Cold Search Initiative. ASSIGNED TO HEALTH AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 DEFER TO PRIME

I.R. NO. 1563 Appropriating funds in connection with the planning of addition and renovation to the Sixth District Court (CP 1106) ASSIGNED TO HUMAN RESOURCES AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 DEFER TO PRIME

I.R. NO. 1564 Appropriating funds in connection with the Fiber Cabling Network and systems upgrades (CP 1726) ASSIGNED TO HUMAN RESOURCES AND FINANCE

& FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 DEFER TO PRIME

I.R. NO. 1565 Appropriating funds in connection with intersection improvements to CR 80, Montauk Highway at East Tiana Road, Town of Southampton (CP 5045) ASSIGNED TO PUBLIC WORKS & TRANSPORTATION AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 DEFER TO PRIME

I.R. NO. 1566 Amending the 2001 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of highway maintenance equipment. (CP 5047) ASSIGNED TO PUBLIC WORKS & TRANSPORTATION AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 DEFER TO PRIME

I.R. NO. 1567 Amending the 2001 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with construction of a highway maintenance facility (Salt Storage Facility) Town of Smithtown (County Executive)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 DEFER TO PRIME

I.R. NO. 1568 Amending the 2001 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Traffic Signal Improvements on various County roads. (CP 5054) ASSIGNED TO PUBLIC WORKS & TRANSPORTATION AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 DEFER TO PRIME

I.R. NO. 1569 Appropriating funds in connection with improvements on Victory Drive at River Road, Town of Brookhaven (CP 5112) ASSIGNED TO PUBLIC WORKS & TRANSPORTATION AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 DEFER TO PRIME

I.R. NO. 1570 Amending the 2001 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the painting of County Bridges at various locations. (CP 5815) ASSIGNED TO PUBLIC WORKS & TRANSPORTATION AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 DEFER TO PRIME

I.R. NO. 1573 Accepting and appropriating 100% grant funds from the New York State Department of Labor to fund a "Community Solutions for Transportation" Program. ASSIGNED TO SOCIAL SERVICES AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 DEFER TO PRIME

I.R. NO. 1577 Accepting and appropriating additional 100% grant funds from the New York State Office of Mental Health to the Department of Health Services, Division of Community Mental Hygiene Services to expand Family Support Programs. ASSIGNED TO HEALTH AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (County Executive)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 DEFER TO PRIME

I.R. NO. 1587 Amending the 2001 Capital Budget and appropriating funds for the jail utilization study (Jail Medical Unit) (CP 3008) ASSIGNED TO PUBLIC SAFETY & PUBLIC INFORMATION AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (Public Safety Committee)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 DEFER TO PRIME

I.R. NO. 1588 Amending the 2001 Capital Budget and appropriating funds for replacement of the equipment shelter at the Mount Misery Radio Tower Site (CP 3203) ASSIGNED TO PUBLIC SAFETY & PUBLIC INFORMATION AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (Public Safety Committee)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 DEFER TO PRIME

I.R. NO. 1589 Amending the 2001 Capital Budget and appropriating funds for the replacement of security booths at County Correctional Facilities (CP 3011) ASSIGNED TO PUBLIC SAFETY & PUBLIC INFORMATION AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (Public Safety Committee)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 DEFER TO PRIME

I.R. NO. 1591 Amending the 2001 Capital Program and Budget and appropriating Planning funds for the construction of a Children's Shelter, Yaphank (CP 3012) ASSIGNED TO EDUCATION AND YOUTH AND FINANCE & FINANCIAL SERVICES (Legislator Andrew Crecca)

VOTE: 5-0-0-0 DEFER TO PRIME

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Okay, that should conclude our business today. Mr. Weiss, before we leave the horseshoe, is there anything you would like to share with the Legislature with respect to the upcoming Operating Budget?

MR. WEISS:

Just one item. Because I spoke at the last committee meeting on how I thought that Medicaid and Social Services was coming in favorable and then we received the Social Services Budget request, which just for the record, called for an increase in net County costs of -- I thought it was thirty million, somewhere between thirty two and thirty seven million dollars on a net County basis. So it's going to be an interesting budget coming up.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Before we leave. Would you be kind enough to report back to this committee at a subsequent meeting, the next meeting about the Executive's position on a draft resolution at this point, to make adjustments to Forensic Scientist's salaries?

MR. WEISS:

I can report right now that we're opposed to it.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Was that subject in negotiations? Was that item, in particular, to adjust those salaries is subject to negotiations?

MR. WEISS:

I don't know. I think that you'd have to have Dave -- but I spoke to Dave this morning and our position is that we're opposed to it.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

On what grounds?

MR. WEISS:

I think Paul mentioned the 1982 arbitration award.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

PERB decision?

MR. WEISS:

PERB decision and also the department is opposed to it. So the County Executive is opposed. The department is opposed to it and we agree with the department.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Could we get that position in writing please?

MR. WEISS:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Thank you.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Before we go; Ken you just mentioned the thirty-two to thirty seven million increase. Is that cover major points that account for that?

MR. WEISS:

Yes, it's Medicaid and MIS. And one of the other programs that's been an emerging program. It's gone from ten million-dollar program in, I believe, 1999, projected to be over thirty million dollars in 2002. That's the institutional foster care, which is to a large extent, controlled by the courts. They designate juveniles to go to mostly upstate facilities and the average cost is about a hundred and twenty to a hundred and thirty thousand dollars per child, per year. And that particular program is only for thirty, I think, thirty-five or thirty seven percent aided. So there's a large County contribution on that. Those are the two major programs but there's also housing. Housing is becoming an issue. Housing costs are going up. You're at the end of the five-year Tariff beginning that. All of our Social Service costs that we had seen tremendous declines from 1994, to the present, we're starting to now see an uptake, which possibly is related to the economy.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

One of these include additional costs that we're going to have to pick up, the New York State or the Federal Government was funding it at one time?

MR. WEISS:

Well, we don't have the State Budget. I mean a lot of this is on the blind. We're assuming that nothing is changed from the State Budget unless we know directly that it has been changed. So my concern is for the first time we may have to submit our budget without having a State Budget and depending on the timing of that, you know the Legislature may have to make some adjustments if they don't pass the budget until after the end of September.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

I believe at a prior meeting, you told us though the trend has been -- I guess, it's a five year trend that New York State and the Federal Government, in part has built their surpluses on cuts to us.

MR. WEISS:

Well, if you look, there was a chart that I got from DSS that has some interesting statistics. The net County cost of the Social Services in 1998, the actual was a hundred and eighteen point eight million dollars on a net basis. The department's 2002 request is two hundred and fourteen million. It's a hundred million-dollar increase in four years, right? Five years. That's pretty significant.

LEGISLATOR LINDSAY:

So Mr. Weiss, you're assuming the assumption is that our funding won't increase from the State? That's with the numbers you're working with now.

MR. WEISS:

Well, there are certain programs where we get reimbursed a percentage. So if our costs go up, you know our aid goes up. But as far as additional percentage increases? No we're not assuming any increases from the State. That hasn't been the tradition of the State in the last several years.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

All right, given these projections of rising cost to County Government, is it anticipated that any adjustments will be made in overall County expenditures between now and the end of the year? Above and beyond those actions already taken?

MR. WEISS:

A lot of this is factored into our projections for this year. In other words, I think, this year is going to be okay. I think we're going to have some sort of a surplus at the end of the year, largely because we increased the sales tax. I don't think the surplus is going to exceed the amount of additional money we're getting from the sales tax this year. But I don't see a problem this year as far as appropriations. But we're going to have you know a difficult budget to put together for 2002.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Can you share with us any insights into what your crystal ball is telling you?

MR. WEISS:

I thought all along that we were going to have a double-digit increase in the police district. I don't see anything changing. The real question is whether or not we can get the general fund down to a small tax increase and that we're going to spend the whole summer working on so -- I'm not sure when the next meeting is but you know -- each meeting I'll have more information.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

The last week in July?

MR. WEISS:

Okay, by then I'll have, at least, the estimates for this year done.

CHAIRMAN CARACCIOLO:

Okay. Any other questions? If not, that concludes the business before the committee. The committee stands adjourned. Thank you.

(The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 a.m.)

{ } Denotes spelled phonetically